

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00865 01 OF 02 161953Z

45

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ACDA-19 SS-20 NSC-10 ISO-00 CIAE-00

PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-11 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01

SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAM-01 SAJ-01 EB-11 OMB-01

AEC-11 DRC-01 /170 W

----- 073472

R 161616Z FEB 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4119

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3715

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

USCINCEUR

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0865

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: FORTHCOMING WORK IN NATO

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE

SUMMARY: THIS MESSAGE REVIEWS MISSION'S CURRENT THINKING ON FORTHCOMING WORK IN NATO ON MBFR. IN MISSION'S VIEW, PATTERN ESTABLISHED IN BASIC ALLIANCE POSITION (C-M(73)83) FOR DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES BETWEEN THE COUNCIL IN RUSSELS AND THE AD HOC GROUP IN VIENNA IS WORKING SATISFACTORILY AND IS SUPPORTED BY THE ALLIES AND THE NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES. SCOPE OF FUNDAMENTAL MBFR ISSUES REQUIRING ATTENTION IN THE ALLIANCE IS EVIDENT FROM THE FORTHCOMING SPC/WG WORK PROGRAM
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00865 01 OF 02 161953Z

(TEXT SEPTTEL). IT INDICATES THE TREND TOWARD A CONTINUED ROLE BY THE NAC AS COORDINATION OF ALLIED POSITIONS AND FORMULATOR OF ALLIED GUIDANCE TO THE AD HOC GROUP ON NEGOTIATING POLICY. THIS TIGHT INTERACTION BETWEEN THE COUNCIL AND AN ALLIED

NEGOTIATING TEAM IS A MAJOR EAST-WEST NEGOTIATION IS UNIQUE
IN ALLIANCE HISTORY.

AS NEGOTIATIONS PROGRESS, IT IS IMPORTANT TO ENSURE THAT WORK
IN NATO IS GEARED TO MESH EFFECTIVELY WITH THE NEEDS OF THE AD
HOC GROUP, IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT NEGOTIATORS RECEIVE TIMELY
GUIDANCE ON EMERGING ISSUES IN VIENNA. MISSION GIVES ITS ASSES-
MENT BELOW ON WHICH ISSUES THE ALLIES ARE LIKELY TO CONSIDER
APPROPRIATE FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE NAC AND ON WHAT MISSION
PRIORITIES SHOULD BE. WE WOULD APPRECIATE COMMENTS FROM
WASHINGTON AND USDEL MBFR. END SUMMARY.

1. NOW THAT COUNCIL HAS REACHED AGREEMENT ON GUIDANCE TO AD
HOC GROUP ON STABILIZING MEASURES (USNATO 825), ALLIES WILL
FOCUS ATTENTION ON OTHER ASPECTS OF MBFR REQUIRING CONSIDERATION.
SPC/MBFR WORKING GROUP PROGRAM OUTLINES NEAR-TERM STEPS. THIS
IS AN APPROPRIATE TIME, THEREFORE, TO REVIEW OUR EXPERIENCE
WITH THE NAC-AHG RELATIONSHIP AND TO EXAMINE FUTURE TASKS WHICH
NATO MIGHT UNDERTAKE TO PROVIDE BEST SUPPORT TO MBFR NEGOTIATORS.

2. FACT THAT MBFR IS CONFINED TO REPRESENTATIVES FROM NATO AND
WP COUNTRIES HAS ALWAYS SUGGESTED THAT NAC WOULD WISH TO
MAINTAIN STEERING HAND OVER NEGOTIATING POLICY. C-M(73)83
RECOGNIZES THIS IN CALLING UPON THE COUNCIL "TO ENSURE CONSULTA-
TIONS LEADING TO AGREEMENT ON ALL QUESTIONS OF OBJECTIVES,
POLICY AND STRATEGY." AD HOC GROUP IS GIVEN CLEAR "RESPONSIBILITY
FOR ALLIED TACTICS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS AND FOR CONDUCTING THE
NEGOTIATIONS THEMSELVES." EXPERIENCE THUS FAR HAS, IN MISSION'S
VIEW, BORNE OUT THE REASONS THAT LEAD TO THIS DIVISION OF LABOR.

3. COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED BASIC POSITION ITSELF, HAS APPROVED
ALLIED FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL, HAS FORWARDED BASIC DATA, AND HAS
PROVIDED BOTH INTERIM AND DETAILED GUIDANCE ON STABILIZING
MEASURES. NAC HAS GIVEN ALLIED NEGOTIATORS FULL TACTICAL
FLEXIBILITY AND WIDE AUTHORITY IN THE FIELD OF PRESS RELATIONS.
BRIEFINGS OF NAC EVERY THREE WEEKS BY AHG CHAIRMAN AND
DETAILED AHG REPORTING CABLES HAVE PROVEN SUCCESSFUL IN
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00865 01 OF 02 161953Z

MAINTAINING COMMUNICATION WITH ALLIED NEGOTIATORS AND IN PROVIDING
NAC WITH A GOOD "FEEL" FOR NEGOTIATIONS IN VIENNA.

4. TO OUR KNOWLEDGE, ALL ALLIES AS WELL AS NATO MILITARY AUTHOR-
ITIES HAVE FOUND THESE ARRANGEMENTS SATISFACTORY. THEY ENABLE
COUNCIL AND MNA'S TO ENSURE THAT MBFR POSITIONS TAKE INTO
ACCOUNT OTHER MAJOR ALLIANCE CONCERNS, E.G. BURDENSARING,
FORCE IMPROVEMENTS, FORCE PLANNING, NATIONAL DEFENSE POLICIES,
IMPLEMENTATION OF NATO-AGREED STRATEGY, RELATED EAST-WEST
DEVELOPMENTS. AT THE SAME TIME, THEY HELP ENSURE THAT THE
COUNCIL AND DPC DO NOT LOSE SIGHT OF MBFR CONSIDERATIONS IN THEIR
CONSULTATIONS ON THESE OTHER ISSUES. THEY ALSO ENABLE ALLIANCE
TO MARSHAL RESOURCES OF NATO CIVIL AND MILITARY BODIES AND STAFFS

TO UNDERTAKE THE TIME-CONSUMING TASK OF HAMMERING OUT AGREED POSITIONS ON BASIC MBFR ISSUES, THEREBY FREEING ALLIED NEGOTIATORS FOR HEAVY DEMANDS OF CONDUCTING TALK THEMSEVLES.

5. THIS CLOSE INTERACTION BETWEEN THE COUNCIL AND AN ALLIED NEGOTIATING TEAM IS UNIQUE IN NATO'S EXPERIENCE. SALT CONSULTATIONS HAVE WORKED WELL, BUT THE ALLIES RECOGNIZE THAT THEIR ROLE IN THAT BILATERAL NEGOTIATION IS NOT CONTROLLING. NATO WAS, OF COURSE, THE FORUM FOR DETAILED PREPARATIONS FOR CSCE-MPT IN HELSINKI, BUT PARTLY DUE TO THE SCOPE OF THE CSCE, THE COUNCIL DID NOT ATTEMPT TO MAINTAIN CLOSE POLICY DIRECTION OVER THE PREPATORY TALKS. WE EXPECT THAT THE COUNCIL WILL DEVOTE ITS ATTENTION FROM TIME TO TIME ON MAJOR ISSUES EMERGING FROM CSCE (E.G., FOLLOW-ON MACHINERY, LEVEL OF THIRD STAGE, HUMAN CONTACTS, MILITARY SECURITY), BUT THE INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNCIL AND MBFR IS BOUND TO BE MORE PROFOUND AND CONSISTENT, BECAUSE OF MBFR'S IMPORT FOR NATO'S COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND BECAUSE OF THE DIVERGENT SECURITY INTERESTS AMONG INDIVIDUAL ALLIES ON A WIDE RANGE OF MBFR ISSUES.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 00865 02 OF 02 162005Z

45

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ACDA-19 SS-20 NSC-10 ISO-00 CIAE-00

PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-11 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01

SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAM-01 SAJ-01 EB-11 OMB-01

AEC-11 DRC-01 /170 W

----- 073520

R 161616Z FEB 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4120

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3716

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

USCINCEUR

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0865

6. INDEED IT IS LIKELY THAT ALLIES' INTEREST IN NATO CONSULTATIONS ON BASIC MBFR ISSUES WILL GROW, AS NEGOTIATIONS GO DEEPER INTO SUBSTANCE AND PRESSURE GROWS ON ALLIES TO MAKE CONCESSIONS. NAC HAS ALREADY CHARGED SPC WITH EXAMINATION OF LINKAGE BETWEEN PHASES. THE CONTINUING INTERWEAVING INTO MBFR TALKS OF EUROPEAN

INTEGRATION QUESTIONS WILL DRAW THE COUNCIL'S ATTENTION INCREASINGLY TO THESE COMPLEX ISSUES, WHICH GO TO THE HEART OF EUROPE'S FUTURE.

7. AT THE SAME TIME, THIS INTERRELATIONSHIP WILL CALL FOR CAREFUL CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT, TO ENSURE THAT NATO'S ACTIVITIES ENHANCE US INTERESTS IN MBFR NEGOTIATIONS. THIS WILL REQUIRE ATTENTIVE CONSIDERATION AS TO THE TIMING, PRESENTATION AND SCOPE OF US INPUTS. MISSION WILL NEED SUFFICIENT LEAD TIME TO DEVELOP CONSENSUS IN ALLIANCE, PARTICULARLY ON ISSUES REQUIRING UNDERSTANDING, DISCUSSION AND FUNDAMENTAL POLITICAL DECISIONS
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00865 02 OF 02 162005Z

BY GOVERNMENTS IN CAPITALS. EVEN ON SOMEWHAT MORE TECHNICAL SUBJECTS, IT WILL BE IMPORTANT TO MAINTAIN CLEAR PRIORITIES.

8. AT THIS JUNCTURE, IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO HAVE WASHINGTON AND USDEL MBFR COMMENTS ON THE MISSION'S SENSE OF PRIORITY ON THE ISSUES WHICH ARE NOW OR WILL SOON BE EXAMINED IN NATO. OUR ESTIMATES FOLLOW:

A. REMAINING STABILIZING MEASURES--WE PLAN TO GIVE HIGH PRIORITY TO PARA 29 MEASURES. ON PARA 30 MEASURES, WE FAVOR A DELIBERATE PACE, NOT SO SLOW AS TO HEIGHTEN POLITICAL CONCERNS OF FLANK STATES, BUT NOT SO FAST AS TO FORCE AHG INTO PREMATURE DISCUSSIONS OF THIS TROUBLESOME ISSUE.

B. VERIFICATION--COMPLETION OF STUDY BY TIME AHG RECONVENES FOLLOWING EASTER RECESS.

C. LINK BETWEEN PHASES--THIS IS, OF COURSE, TOGETHER WITH THE AIR/NUCLEAR FACTOR (WHICH WILL ALSO REQUIRE NAC CONSULTATIONS), THE MOST CRUCIAL ISSUE CONFRONTING THE ALLIES IN MBFR AT THE MOMENT, SINCE IT RELATES TO PROVIDING SOVIETS WITH SOME ASSURANCES ABOUT INCLUSION OF EUROPEAN FORCES AND PERHAPS A FREEZE ON THOSE FORCES, AND TO FUTURE EUROPEAN DEFENSE INTEGRATION. GIVEN THE COMPLEXITY AND POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS ISSUE, MISSION BELIEVES WASHINGTON SHOULD CONSIDER A SOMEWHAT FASTER PACE IN CONSULTATIONS WITH ALLIES IN NATO ON THIS SUBJECT, IN ORDER TO LAY THE GROUND FOR DEVELOPING COMMON APPROACHES. A FIRST STEP MIGHT BE TO ENCOURAGE ONE OF THE EUROPEAN ALLIES (E.G., FRG) TO TABLE A PAPER IN NATO IDENTIFYING SOME OF THE STEPS BETWEEN PHASES I AND II, PERHAPS ALONG LINES OF PARA 2 IN VIENNA 1206. IN OUR VIEW, U.S. NEEDS TO BE LOW-KEY IN ENCOURAGING THIS STEP, SINCE WE COULD EASILY GIVE RISE TO EUROPEAN ALLIED CONCERNS THAT WE ARE WILLING TO "SELL OUT" THEIR "EUROPEAN" ASPIRATIONS IN RETURN FOR A QUICK REDUCTIONS DEAL WITH THE SOVIETS.

D. NON-CIRCUMVENTION--AN EARLY U.S. CONTRIBUTION ON THIS SUBJECT WOULD BE USEFUL SINCE IT RELATES TO FLANK CONCERNS AND DESIRES OF OTHERS TO INCLUDE SOVIET TERRITORIES.

E. WITHDRAWAL OR TERMINATION FROM AN MBFR AGREEMENT--COULD
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00865 02 OF 02 162005Z

BE COMBINED WITH OUTLINE OF BASIC PROVISIONS (SEE BELOW).

F. BASIC PROVISIONS OF AN INITIAL MBFR AGREEMENT--WHEN THE
SHAPE OF NEGOTIATIONS BECOMES CLEARER, WASHINGTON SHOULD BEGIN
OUTLINING TO ALLIES OUR PREFERRED STRUCTURE FOR AN INITIAL MBFR
AGREEMENT. CONSULTATIONS ON THE SHAPE OF AN AGREEMENT MAY
PROVE TIME-CONSUMING AND WE SHOULD NOT DELAY TOO LONG IN TABLING
INITIAL U.S. VIEWS. RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 16 FEB 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO00865
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740267/abbrythq.tel
Line Count: 232
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 21 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <21 MAR 2002 by shawdg>; APPROVED <01 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: FORTHCOMING WORK IN NATO
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
GENEVA
SALT TWO GENEVA
USCINCEUR

MOSCOW

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005